### DA

Military recruitment is increasing in the squo because the job seems attractive.

Alvarez 9 Lizette Alvarez (Miami bureau chief for The New York Times since January 2011) “More Americans Joining Military as Jobs Dwindle” January 18th 2009 The New York Times <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/01/19/us/19recruits.html?pagewanted=all> JW 1/1/15

As the number of jobs across the nation dwindles, more Americans are joining the military, lured by a steady paycheck, benefits and training. The last fiscal year was a banner one for the military, with all active-duty and reserve forces meeting or exceeding their recruitment goals for the first time since 2004, the year that violence in Iraq intensified drastically, Pentagon officials said. And the trend seems to be accelerating. The Army exceeded its targets each month for October, November and December — the first quarter of the new fiscal year — bringing in 21,443 [thousand] new soldiers on active duty and in the reserves. December figures were released last week. Recruiters also report that more people are inquiring about joining the military, a trend that could further bolster the ranks. Of the four armed services, the Army has faced the toughest recruiting challenge in recent years because of high casualty rates in Iraq and long deployments overseas. Recruitment is also strong for the Army National Guard, according to Pentagon figures. The Guard tends to draw older people. “When the economy slackens and unemployment rises and jobs become more scarce in civilian society, recruiting is less challenging,” said Curtis Gilroy, the director of accession policy for the Department of Defense.

People will be less likely to join the military if civilian pay is higher.

**VanFossen 2k** Phillip VanFossen (former high school and middle school economics teacher and coach, He was there at the beginning of EconEdLink, having written the first NetNewsLine lesson for the site. He has served as the Review Board Chair since 1999. He currently serves as the James F. Ackerman Professor of Social Studies Education, Director of the Ackerman Center for Democratic Citizenship at Purdue University, and Associate Director of the Purdue Center for Economic Education. He also currently serves as Interim Head of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Purdue. His research interest is in how classroom teachers apply digital technology in their teaching. He has published widely in the area and in economic education generally. In addition, Phillip has traveled on more than 15 trips to half a dozen nations (primarily in Eastern Europe) to conduct economic education seminars). “‘Be All You Can Be’...For Minimum Wage?” Econ Ed Link. March 23rd, 2000. http://www.econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=94&type=educator

As we might have expected, more young men and women were in the military service in 1980 (at the end of the draft) than were serving in 1999 (nearly 20 years after the end of compulsory service). However, the greatest percentage decrease in service personnel took place from 1990 to 1995, more than 10 years after the end of the compulsory service requirement. It looks as if some other factors may account for the dramatic drop-off in the number of military personnel in service. What might some of these factors be? [Budget cuts, low pay, military no longer seen as an attractive career, post-Viet Nam attitude changes, post-Desert Storm cutbacks.] Robert **Schlesinger has an economic explanation for** this mystery in his article "Army Reserve Battling an Exodus ." What does Schlesinger say are the **main causes of** this mass **exodus of military personnel**? [ (a) Tight labor markets--U.S. prosperity means that most everyone has a job, and low-paying industries like fast food restaurants are forced to pay more than minimum wage to attract workers; (b) lack of prestige to military service; (c) mostly due to low wages **relative to other, less dangerous occupations**, the base pay of a private in the U.S. Army is about the same as starting wages at fast food restaurants.] armyLet's test Schlesinger's theory by comparing the base salary of a private in the U.S. Army with what the same person might make earning the minimum wage in the civilian world. Currently the minimum wage in the United States is $5.15/hour. If our civilian worker is working 40 hours per week over 50 weeks then how much would he or she earn in a year? [$5.15/hr. X 40 hrs./week X 50 weeks = $10,300] What does a private earn per year? Log on to the military monthly base pay table, Basic Military Pay . Assume that our private (rank rating of E-1) has less than two years experience. What is her annual salary? [$12,060] Using a 2000 hour work year (as we did above), what is her hourly wage? [$6.03] So the private, who is risking her life for her country, is making $.88 an hour more than the civilian burger flipper! In order to compete, the Army (and the other branches of service) must use other, non-salary incentives to attract personnel. What might some of these incentives be? [College tuition, enlistment bonuses, housing and food allowances.] Log on to the Army's Recruitment Page to find several examples of these incentives. Let's look at how one of these incentives, the housing allowance, contributes to our private's income. Using the Army's Basic Allowance for Housing Database , chose your private's rank and state. What is the monthly housing allowance? [Answers will vary depending on location, but should be in the range of $425/month for a single soldier, $550/month for a soldier with dependents.] Adding this monthly allowance to the private's salary means an annual income of how much? [Approximately $17,160 for the single soldier; $18,660 for the solider with dependents.] **With** this **additional income, our private is** now clearly **making more than the minimum wage worker**, but is it enough to get by? To learn more about the financial strain some military families experience read Feeling the Pinch of a Marine Salary . Is it possible that, even with housing and food allowances, many U.S. soldiers and sailors are--as the previous article implies-- living in poverty? If our private were the only breadwinner for her family of four (herself and three dependents), what is the US Census Bureau's Poverty Threshold ? [$16,954] Is our private 'living in poverty'? [Clearly no, but she's not too far removed...her income is only $1,700 above the poverty threshold for a family of four with three dependents and she's risking her life for her country...!] **Two basic tenets of economic behavior are that every decision has a cost** (Economic Content Standard 1 ) **and that people respond to incentives** (Economic Content Standard 4 ). **If U.S. citizens chose to join the military, they 'trade-off'** the possibility of **other** (perhaps more lucrative) **forms of employment. If the choice is between a potentially dangerous career in the military**, then, **or a safer, more stable civilian career where the pay is better, rational people will choose the latter**. It would seem that Congress, the president and the nation's military leadership have recognized these issues (as well as the severity of this most recent labor shortage), as recent legislation has been passed that gives military personnel the largest pay raise (4.8%) since 1981. Perhaps those who are trying to "Be All They Can Be" can do so on a bit more than minimum wage. The article Military Pay Raise Gap does a nice job of exemplifying this dilemma.

Living wage makes maintaining the military nearly impossible.

Maki 14 (has been involved in the peace, labor, civil rights, and environmental movements for over 30 years) Alan L. Maki “Minimum Wage and the Military in Minnesota” Selecting Stones August 12th 2014 <http://selectingstones.com/2014/08/12/minimum-wage-and-the-military-in-minnesota/> JW 2/20/15

People like to say that we have no more draft in America. Politicians have learned the way to avoid a draft is to keep working class youth very poor — one of the reasons they refuse to raise the minimum wage to a real living wage, though nobody seems to want to talk about this. Most young people, if they had a job, and if the job paid real living wages, would never think of “volunteering” for the military. The United States has a draft, an economic draft. Maintaining the legal minimum wage as a poverty wage is a part of this draft. Military recruiters concoct any lie they can think of to hoodwink young people into joining the military, but the main lie they spread concerns how economically well off they will supposedly be when — never mentioning if — they get back. The situation is even more difficult for youth of color, who have an even more difficult time finding employment because of racist discrimination. For Native American youth, trapped in the racist unemployment of reservation life, this is even more of an issue. The fact is, and anyone can think about this, it would be nearly impossible for the United States government to maintain a military if everyone who wants a job had a job paying real living wages. In Minnesota, one union that was a big pusher for the $9.50/hour minimum wage law, the United Food and Commercial Workers, actually allows young people to come into the stores that it has organized, and to bag and carry out groceries solely for “tips”. The military recruiters actually come into these stores to harass these youth as they are trying to scrape together a few dollars.

Military readiness is key to prevent multiple nuclear conflicts.

**O’Hanlon and Kagan 7** Michael O’Hanlon, Senior Fellow and Sydney Stein Jr. Chair in Foreign Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution and Frederick Kagan, Resident Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, and “The Case for Larger Ground Forces”, Stanley Foundation Report, April, http://stanleyfoundation.org/publications/other/Kagan\_OHanlon\_07.pdf

We live at a time when wars not only rage in nearly every region but threaten to erupt in many places where the current relative calm is tenuous. To view this as a strategic military challenge for the United States is not to espouse a specific theory of America’s role in the world or a certain political philosophy. Such an assessment flows directly from the basic bipartisan view of American foreign policy makers since World War II that overseas **threats must be countered before they** can directly **threaten** this country’s shores, that the basic stability of **the international system** is essential to American peace and prosperity, and that **no country besides the U**nited **S**tates **is in a position to lead the way** in countering major challenges to the global order. Let us highlight the **threats** and their consequences with a few concrete examples, emphasizing those that **involve key strategic regions** of the world such as the Persian Gulf and East Asia, **or** key potential threats to American security, such as the **spread of nuclear weapons** and the strengthening of the global Al Qaeda/jihadist movement. The Iranian government has rejected a series of international demands to halt its efforts at enriching uranium and submit to international inspections. What will happen if the US—or Israeli—government becomes convinced that **Tehran is on the verge** of fielding a nuclear weapon? **North Korea**, of course, **has already done so**, and the ripple effects are beginning to spread. Japan’s recent election to supreme power of a leader who has promised to rewrite that country’s constitution to support increased armed forces—and, possibly, even nuclear weapons— may well alter the delicate balance of fear in Northeast Asia fundamentally and rapidly. Also, in the background, at least for now, Sino- **Taiwan**ese **tensions continue to flare, as do tensions between India and Pakistan**, Pakistan and Afghanistan, Venezuela and the United States, and so on. Meanwhile, the world’s nonintervention in Darfur troubles consciences from Europe to America’s Bible Belt to its bastions of liberalism, yet with no serious international forces on offer, the bloodletting will probably, tragically, continue unabated. And as bad as things are in Iraq today, they could get worse. What would happen if the key Shiite figure, Ali al Sistani, were to die? If another major attack on the scale of the Golden Mosque bombing hit either side (or, perhaps, both sides at the same time)? Such deterioration might convince many Americans that the war there truly was lost—but the costs of reaching such a conclusion would be enormous. Afghanistan is somewhat more stable for the moment, although a major Taliban offensive appears to be in the offing. Sound US grand strategy must proceed from the recognition that, over the next few years and decades, the world is going to be a very unsettled and quite dangerous place, with Al Qaeda and its associated groups as a subset of a much larger set of worries. **The only** serious **response** to this international environment **is to develop armed forces capable of protecting** America’s **vital interests** throughout this dangerous time. **Doing so requires a military capable of a wide range of missions—including** not only **deterrence of great power conflict in** dealing with potential **hotspots** in Korea, the Taiwan Strait, and the Persian Gulf but also associated with a variety of Special Forces activities and stabilization operations. For today’s US military, which already excels at high technology and is increasingly focused on re-learning the lost art of counterinsurgency, this is first and foremost a question of finding the resources to field a large-enough standing Army and Marine Corps to handle personnelintensive missions such as the ones now under way in Iraq and Afghanistan. Let us hope there will be no such large-scale missions for a while. But preparing for the possibility, while doing whatever we can at this late hour to relieve the pressure on our soldiers and Marines in ongoing operations, is prudent. At worst, the only potential downside to a major program to strengthen the military is the possibility of spending a bit too much money. Recent history shows no link between having a larger military and its overuse; indeed, Ronald Reagan’s time in office was characterized by higher defense budgets and yet much less use of the military, an outcome for which we can hope in the coming years, but hardly guarantee. While the authors disagree between ourselves about proper increases in the size and cost of the military (with O’Hanlon preferring to hold defense to roughly 4 percent of GDP and seeing ground forces increase by a total of perhaps 100,000, and Kagan willing to devote at least 5 percent of GDP to defense as in the Reagan years and increase the Army by at least 250,000), we agree on the need to start expanding ground force capabilities by at least 25,000 a year immediately. Such a measure is not only prudent, it is also badly overdue.

Nuke war causes extinction.

Wickersham 10 Bill (University of Missouri adjunct professor of Peace Studies) “Threat of ‘nuclear winter’ remains New START treaty is step in right direction.” April 11th 2010 http://www.columbiatribune.com/news/2010/apr/11/threat-of-nuclear-winter-remains/

In addressing the environmental consequences of nuclear war, Columbian Steve Starr has written a summary of studies published by the Bulletin of the International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation, which concludes: “U.S. **researchers have confirmed** the scientific validity of the concept of **‘nuclear winter’ and have demonstrated that** any conflict which targets **even a tiny fraction of the global arsenal will cause catastrophic disruptions of the global climate**.” In another statement on his Web site, Starr says: “**If 1% of the nuclear weapons** now ready for war **were detonated** in large cities, **they would utterly devastate the environment, climate, ecosystems and inhabitants of Earth. A war** fought with thousands of strategic nuclear weapons **would leave the Earth uninhabitable**.”

### 2NR Uniqueness

Military recruitment goals are met now but that could change. Competitive military compensation rates are key to continued recruitment efforts.

**Lopez 14** C. Todd Lopez (writes for Army News Service, enlisted in the Air Force in 1998 and after basic training in San Antonio, Texas, was trained as a writer at the Defense Information School at Fort Meade, Md. Media specialist for the military and has been sent to Japan, Turkey, Southwest Asia, Korea, Germany, Honduras, Romania, the Marshall Islands, Kuwait, Afghanistan and Iraq). “Recruiting force remains unchanged, despite shrinking goals.” US Army. January 16th, 2014. http://www.army.mil/article/118369/

"**The total Army percentage of newly enlisted Soldiers** with a high school diploma **was 98 percent**," he said. "**Well above historic rates**. Additionally, **the Army achieved 99 percent for each of its military occupational specialties**." Seamands told lawmakers that the recruiting mission for the Army is shrinking, but that it has decided to maintain its pool of recruiters because their presence in communities builds and maintains trust between civilians and the military. "What the Army is doing is taking a long-term view of the issue," he said. "If you look at our accessions mission for 2014, there is a reduction from 2013. What we opted to do is leave the recruiting force in the communities. We feel that what recruiters do ... is built on trust. You need to keep the recruiters in the high schools, in the communities, in the cities, to have that relationship and that trust. So we maintain roughly the same level of support, despite a reduced mission out in the recruiting force." Vee Penrod, deputy asistant secretary of Defense for Military Personnel Policy, also addressed lawmakers. She said that health and fitness issues prevent many youth from joining the military. Additionally, she said, the opinions of young Americans are changing away from considering the military as an "attractive" lifestyle. Seamands said that **while the Army met recruiting goals, other indicators may be a harbinger of tough** recruiting **times ahead**. One of those indicators is the number of young people enrolled in the Army's Delayed Entry Program. "As we look at our delayed entry pool, we see that decreasing," Seamands said. "We see that as kind of a canary in the coal mine in terms of warning about a tough environment ahead. If you were to go back in time about a year ago, we would have had about half our mission in the Delayed Entry Program. If you look at it now, it's about a third. It's going down." With declining budgets, and the money military services receive for recruiting also decreasing, it becomes more important that the services be able to manage their own funds and use them where they think the funds can best be used. "We believe the services are really in the best position to determine how to spend recruiting dollars," Pinrod said. "They understand their force, they know the requirements, they understand the culture. When the services are directed, or not directed to spend recruiting dollars, it is, we believe, a misdirection of funds. So we absolutely believe the decision should be left to the services. And we provide oversight to ensure they follow policy and law." The Army does not just recruit, it also works to retain Soldiers. When Soldiers choose to leave the active force, the service hopes they transition to the Army National Guard or Army Reserve. To facilitate that, Seamands said the Army has bolstered its relationships with the two reserve components. "We have developed a great partnership with the Reserve and the Guard, and work hand-in-hand with them as we identify and downsize the active component," Seamands said. "If you were to look at the active-component to reserve-component transition, the last couple of years we've exceeded 157 percent two years ago. We've raised the standard, or the goal for that across the board. My counterparts in the Guard and Reserve understand what our process is." The general said one of the things the Army has done with the Reserve recruiters is ensure that Reserve recruiters get to meet earlier with departing active Soldiers. "It becomes part of their thought process about getting out, going into the Reserve and Guard," Seamands said. "We talk about Soldier for Life, where you continue to be a Soldier after you leave the service. We don't like using the words separation of service. It's really a transition, whether you go to be a civilian, or you go into the reserve component." Seamands also told lawmakers that the Army is working to increase recruiting of Soldiers who are equipped to go into the Army's cyber career fields. To that end, he said, recruiters are looking to recruit more among those who have educations and backgrounds in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. He also told legislators that continued support from Congress for funding of recruiting efforts is what will help the Army continue to meet its recruiting goals in a difficult recruiting environment. "Recruiting is expected to become increasingly more difficult due to the tough recruiting environment and the impacts of the budget," Seamands said. "These will likely cause a decline in the entry pool. The **continued support of Congress for** competitive **military** benefits and **compensation**, incentives, bonuses for our Soldiers, and marketing **to help us tell our story will remain** critical **to the** all-volunteer **Army's effort to recruit, retain, and support the highest caliber Soldier**. While we transfer to a smaller Army, we will remain dedicated to improving readiness, and building resilience in our Soldiers, civilians and families."

Living wage is the tipping point.

Burton 13 David Burton (writer from Texas) “Minimum wage makes more per year than our military?! UPDATE: Short answer, yes.” December 10th 2013 HalfTangible <https://halftangible.wordpress.com/2013/12/10/minimum-wage-makes-more-per-year-than-our-military/comment-page-1/> JW 2/20/15

Let’s break it down, shall we? Assuming 2000 hours (40 hours per week, plus two weeks with no pay or work) a wage of 7.25 an hour adds up to 14,500 gross income. According to goarmy.com, a private (as stated on the page, a new soldier generally enters as a private) with less than 2 years of experience earns $18 [thousand dollars],194 (though the website stipulates that the first few months of service pay will be lower, so make of that what you will). A minimum wage of 9 [dollars].097 would get you that same pay. So while no, the military does not earn less than the minimum wage right now, they’re less than 2 dollars an hour from it. (albeit before benefits) While what exactly the minimum wage should be depends on who you ask, a big news item lately has been fast food strikes aiming to gain a wage of $15 an hour. That would add up to 30,000 a year. Earning 30,000 a year in our military requires you to be a Sergeant with four years of experience AT LEAST.